



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

SP

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/988,155	11/19/2001	Jean Sini	19111.0059	8154

23517 7590 08/09/2005

SWIDLER BERLIN LLP
3000 K STREET, NW
BOX IP
WASHINGTON, DC 20007

EXAMINER

THAI, HANH B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2161

DATE MAILED: 08/09/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/988,155

Applicant(s)

SINI, JEAN

Examiner

Hanh B. Thai

Art Unit

2161

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on RCE filed 7/11/05.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3,5,10-12,14,19-21 and 23 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3,5,10-12,14,19-21 and 23 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

This is in response to Request for Continued Examination filed July 11, 2005.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed April 5, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues on pages 10-11 that "neither Gershman nor Steed discloses or suggests creating a mapping for the form based on the information that is entered into the form by the user at the mobile device." Examiner respectfully disagrees. Steed discloses the mapping the fields of the forms ([0009] and [0023]) based on the merchant and user details information. Therefore, Steed alone or the combination of Steed and Gershman discloses the claimed limitation of "a mapping for the form based on the information that is entered into the form."

Claim Objections

2. Claims 1, 10 and 19 are objected to because of the following informalities: There is a typo in limitation "scanning content.....is to entered." Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1, 10 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Steed et al. (US Pub. No. 2002/0107755).

Art Unit: 2161

Regarding claims 1, 10 and 19, Steed discloses a method for automatically entering information into form fields (abstract of Steed) comprising the steps of:

- invoking a application program in response to an indication from a user of a mobile device to do so (see abstract and summary of Steed);
- scanning content transmitted from the application program to the mobile device to find a form having at least one field into which information is to entered (see [0008]; [0012]; [0013]; [0031] to [0039] and [0043]);
- retrieving and entering information to enter into the at least one field (see [0023] to [0026] and [0044], Steed) and transmitting the form including the entered information to the mobile device for display to the user ([0008]; [0012]; [0026]; [0031] to [0039] and [0043]), if the mapping for the form exists ([0009]);

Steed discloses a mapping for the form ([0009]). The claim 1 is overall rejected under “a mapping” scenario, since the “if no mapping” condition is no longer required once mapping already occurred.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-3, 5, 10-12, 14, 19-21 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gershman et al. (US patent no. 6,401,085) in view of Steed et al. (US Pub no. 2002/0107755).

Regarding claims 1, 10 and 19, Gershman discloses a method for automatically entering information into form fields comprising the steps of:

- invoking a application program in response to an indication from a user of a mobile device to do so (see summary and col.2, lines 9-18, Gershman);
- scanning content transmitted from the application program to the mobile device (see col.2, line 66 to col. 3, line 9, Gershman);
- retrieving and entering information to enter into the at least one field (see col. 40, lines 28-54; Fig. 13 and corresponding text, Gershman); and
- transmitting the form including the entered information to the mobile device for display to the user (see Summary and col.37, line 59 to col.38, line10, Gershman).

Gershman, however, does not disclose “a form including the entered information” and “the form having at least one field into which information is to enter, if at least one mapping for the form exists”. Steed, on the other hand, discloses a server-based electronic wallet system that the form is automatically filled data information at the proxy and delivered to the wireless device (see abstract; [0002]; [0003]; [0009] and [0012], Steed). Therefore, Steed discloses the claimed limitation of “automatically entering information into the form”. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Gershman to include the claimed feature as taught by Steed. The motivation of doing so would have been to provide an urgent need for the consumer to request a remote server to fill up a form on his/her behalf (see [0007], Steed).

Art Unit: 2161

Regarding claims 2, 11 and 20, Gershman/Steed combination further discloses the receiving at least one edit made by the user of the mobile device of the entered information; and transmitting the form including the edited entered information to the application program (see [0013] and [0026], Steed). Further, it is inherent for a computer navigator to offer a user the ability to easily edit a display on screen. This ability has in large been the driving force behind the almost universal adoption of the computer as the preferred means of data entry via filling out a form.

Regarding claims 3, 12 and 21, Gershman/Steed combination further discloses the mapping for the form comprises information mapping at least one field of the form into which information is to be entered to stored information (see [0009], Steed).

Regarding claims 5, 14 and 23, Gershman/Steed combination further discloses the updating information mapping at least one field of the form into which information is to be entered to stored information based on the received selection of information made by the user, if the entered information was edited by the user (see [0021] and [0022], Steed).

Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Rawat et al. (US 6,662,340 B2) discloses client-side form filler that populates form fields based on analyzing visible field labels and visible display format hints without previous examination or mapping of the form.

Art Unit: 2161

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hanh B Thai whose telephone number is 571-272-4029. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 AM - 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Safet Metjahic can be reached on 571-272-4023. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Hanh B Thai
Examiner
Art Unit 2161

August 4, 2005


UYEN LE
PRIMARY EXAMINER